

only 2 percent of ours allowed into China.

On a strictly trade-by-trade basis, China does not reciprocate the trade benefits we grant to them under MFN status. The result is a \$34 billion United States trade deficit with China in 1995. As we can see from this chart, only 10 years ago we were reasonably in balance with a \$10 million trade deficit with China, and over the past 10 years the trade deficit has increased to just about \$34 billion.

Mr. Speaker, supporters of MFN will say that U.S. exports have tripled in the course of that time. They have, but Chinese exports to the United States have increased elevenfold, therefore resulting in this very extreme imbalance.

The deficit is expected to exceed \$41 billion in 1996, and does not include the economic loss of Chinese piracy of our intellectual property, which costs the United States economy over \$2.5 billion each year. It does not include the loss to our economy on Chinese insistence on offsets, production and technology transfer, which hurt American workers and rob our economic future, and it does not include money gained by China in the illegal smuggling of AK-47s and other weapons into the United States by the Chinese military.

Members will hear that trade with China is important for United States jobs. When President Clinton made his statement accompanying his request to renew MFN, he claimed new exports to China supported 170,000 American jobs. These jobs are very important. However, they must be seen in the larger context. Other trade relationships of comparable size, of, say, a \$56 billion trade relationship, produce many, many more jobs because our trade relationship is more in balance. More of our exports are allowed into other countries' markets.

Other trade relationships of comparable size to the China-United States trade relationship support at least twice as many jobs. For example, the United States-United Kingdom trade relationship totaling \$2 billion less than the United States-China relationship supports 432,000 jobs. The trade is less but the number of jobs is well over 2 times. The United States-South Korea relationship is \$8 billion less than the United States-China trade relationship. It supports 381,000 jobs, well over double the Chinese trade relationship. Why? Because of lack of market access for United States products into the Chinese marketplace.

We must also be concerned about the harm to our economy of the technology transfer and production transfer which is accompanying United States investment in China and United States sales to China. The Chinese Government demands that companies wishing to obtain access to the Chinese market not only build factories there, so that the products are made in China, not in the United States, but that they also transfer state-of-the-art technology to do so. The Government then takes that

technology, misappropriates it, the companies have little choice, because they want to access the market. We are helping the Chinese Government build our own competitors, using our state-of-the-art technology. Time does not permit me to go further, but more will come.

ENVIRONMENTAL ESTROGENS AND THEIR LINKS TO BREAST CANCER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, sadly, I am not surprised by an article in last Friday's Washington Post regarding yet another environmental health risk. The article discusses a new scientific study showing major health risk posed by chemicals commonly found in our environment. Despite even the best of intentions, a number of unnerving health trends are being linked with increased human contamination by chemical hormones.

The chemicals responsible for causing endocrine system dysfunctions have been used in common pesticides and industrial chemicals for decades. Known as environmental estrogens, these chemicals can actually mimic the hormone estrogen that naturally occurs in the human body. These synthetic hormones have the capacity to severely alter one's endocrine system, leading to an increased risk of major health problems, including breast cancer.

Breast cancer is expected to strike over 180,000 American women in 1996, and the lifetime risk for the disease has increased from a 1 in 20 chance in the 1950's to a 1 in 8 chance today. Breast cancer is the leading cause of death of women between the ages of 35 and 52, and 70 percent of newly diagnosed cases have no family history of this deadly cancer.

Environmental estrogens are largely responsible for these alarming figures. A recent study by the Mount Sinai School of Medicine showed that women with high exposures to DDT had four times the breast cancer risk of women with low exposures.

No matter how careful we are in watching what we eat and drink, exposure to chemical hormones is unavoidable in today's world. They occur in the herbicides we apply to our lawns, shoe polishes, paints, paper products we use every day, and in pesticides on the food we eat.

While we still have much to learn about toxic chemicals, what we do know thus far is cause for major concern and serious action. As a member of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, I am proud to have supported the passage of the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments in the Commerce Committee markup last week. This important legislation includes

many reform proposals which address the most serious risks presented by contaminants in drinking water. The proposed amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act will provide for an estrogenic substances screening program. Under this program, substances will be measured to determine if they produce effects in humans similar to those produced by naturally occurring estrogens.

In 1971, Congress passed the National Cancer Act, increasing resources for cancer research and broadening the mandate of the National Cancer Institute, a subsidiary of the National Institutes of Health. The infusion of funds following this act led to the genetic revolution in cancer and biomedicine in general. Continued funding for the NIH represents an investment in research as well as in investment to improve the Nation's health.

To protect the rights of those with identifiable disease characteristics like breast cancer in their genetic makeup, I have introduced H.R. 2690, the Genetic Privacy Act. This legislation will ensure that the new discoveries made in genetic testing research are not misused. For example, in the past 2 years, BRCA 1 and BRCA 2 were identified as major breast cancer genes. Together they account for perhaps 90 percent of familial breast cancer.

While this finding indeed benefits women, enabling them to take necessary preventive measures, negative consequences are also very likely. My bill establishes guidelines concerning disclosure and use of genetic information with regard to insurability, employability, and confidentiality.

Reducing the burden of cancer can be measured in terms of fewer deaths, fewer new cases, increased length of survival, and increased quality of life of cancer survivors. While improvements in cancer treatment have been made, overall cancer incidence continues to rise, emphasizing the formidable task ahead. The goal of a reduced cancer burden can only be achieved by the successful translation of discoveries to the benefit of all people who are at risk and who have been diagnosed with cancer.

Last weekend marked the seventh annual national race for the cure. The race was named "Doing It For Martha" in honor of Martha Maloney, a longtime staffer of Senator WENDELL FORD. The race will serve as a reminder to everyone of the impending threat of breast cancer. I was proud to have my staff participating as a team in the 1996 race for the cure.

Cervantes once said, "The beginning of health is to know the disease." To succeed in the fight against cancer requires that we have the vision to recognize new opportunities and the flexibility and energy to capture such opportunities for progress. Our responsibility is to all people, for cancer threatens all of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that a cooperative effort by Congress, the scientific community, and regulators will

yield new findings and beneficial results not only for the environmental health of this country, but for the health of current and future generations.

□ 1245

GOP SLASHES MEDICARE AND MEDICAID WHILE INCREASING DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Republicans passed their budget plan which actually increases the deficit starting next year. Projections show that the 1996 deficit will be approximately \$130 billion, but under the GOP plan it will increase to \$153 billion in 1997. The GOP deficit is also higher in 1998 than this year's deficit.

I ask why. The reason is because the GOP are intent on their large tax breaks for the wealthy, part of which are paid for through excessive Medicare cuts.

In 1992 the deficit was \$290 billion and in 1993 it was \$255 billion. Under Democratic leadership the deficit has actually dropped 4 years in a row to the projected \$130 billion of this year.

What is the reason for the Republican deficit increase? Misplaced priorities, tax breaks for their wealthy friends, and a slush fund for future unnecessary tax breaks. While the Republicans claim to be deficit hawks and the saviors of Medicare, the facts indicate that they are intent on pushing this country further into debt and making large and unnecessary cuts in Medicare.

This Republican deficit-increasing budget also makes extreme cuts of \$72 billion over 6 years to the Medicaid Program and allows States to cut an additional \$178 billion, for a grand total of \$250 billion in Medicaid cuts. We are talking about major cuts in Medicaid as well as Medicare.

Many people look at the Medicaid Program as primarily for the poor, and, of course, it does assist poor people, but it also pays about 50 percent of all nursing home care for senior citizens. Without Medicaid, many middle-class adult children of nursing home parents will have to pay for their parents' expensive care, while at the same time trying to send their own children through college.

Last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, voted on the Medicaid Repeal Act, which I vigorously fought. The Medicaid Repeal Act will eliminate all current guarantees of health care coverage and eliminate current guarantees of nursing home benefits to the elderly. This is the Medicaid Repeal Act that the Republican leadership is putting forward.

I offered an amendment to this act that would return these guarantees in this terrible legislation, but it was rejected by every Republican. Other Democrats offered similar amendments to continue health care coverage for the disabled, for children, for pregnant women, but again all those amendments were defeated by the Republicans.

On top of all this, the GOP Medicaid Repeal Act will sharply reduce payments to hospitals for care. Compounded with the extreme Gingrich-Dole Medicare cuts to hospitals, many will be forced to close their doors, especially hospitals that receive a majority of their income from Medicare and Medicaid.

Many hospitals in my home State of New Jersey are in this situation. They are highly Medicare and Medicaid dependent. I am very concerned about their being able to survive these steep cuts that have been proposed by the Republicans in Medicare and Medicaid.

Again, the Republican plans will reduce access to health care services. At a time when Congress should be seeking ways to decrease the number of uninsured and underinsured, the Republican leadership's answers will make these problems worse.

I thought it was interesting to see Speaker GINGRICH take the floor this morning and talk about how he is trying to increase portability and also increase health insurance for those with preexisting health conditions through the Kennedy-Kassebaum legislation. But that reality is that the Speaker and the rest of the Republican leadership have been insisting on including medical savings accounts in this Kennedy-Kassebaum health care reform.

What that will mean is that the healthy and the wealthy will opt out of the traditional health insurance programs and the cost for everyone else for health insurance will go up. So again, even though the Republican leadership talks about how they are trying to expand health care options, in fact what they are doing is making those options fewer because more and more people will not be able to afford health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say in conclusion that in the past Democrats were able to decrease the deficit and preserve Medicare and Medicaid. The Republicans have misplaced priorities and values. The Democrats have a proven track record of reducing the deficit and ensuring that senior citizens have adequate health care. I remain committed to fighting these Republican efforts that would raise the deficit while at the same time slashing Medicare and Medicaid.

HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM HELD HOSTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] is

recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I represent probably the most diverse district in the State of Illinois. I represent part of the city of Chicago, the south suburbs in Cook and Will Counties, industrial communities like Rockdale and Bradley and La Salle/Peru, farm towns and a lot of cornfields.

Because my district is so very diverse, I am always looking for commonality, common concerns that the working people of my diverse district have.

I find that a major concern of working families, of course, is finding ways to make health care work better for working families and reforming health care. Of course my predecessor talked about Medicare.

Frankly I want to make it very clear that we Republicans are committed to saving Medicare from Bankruptcy. The trustees just a few weeks ago say if we do nothing, Medicare goes bankrupt in 5½ years. In fact, the Republican budget increases funding for Medicare by \$724 billion, a 62 percent funding increase for Medicare. We are committed to saving Medicare.

We are also committed to raising take-home pay for working families, increasing the opportunity for working Americans, and also helping small business and their employees. As that common concern which resonates in my district, and, that is, making health care better by improving access and by improving health care, of course, that is a concern I have got.

I know it is a priority in this Congress to reform health care. Over the last 16 months I have held town meetings and talked with a lot of my neighbors about what we can do to make health care better. When you listen and you learn the concerns of the people that I represent, frankly you learn, No. 1, that there are 40 million Americans today that do not have health care insurance. When you listen to those 40 million Americans you learn something that frankly is a surprise for many people, and, that is, that 85 percent of those without health care coverage are self-employed, they are small-business people, they are employees of these small businesses, and they are families.

The chief reason they are unable to obtain health insurance is because they cannot find affordable rates of health insurance. We are committed to making health care more affordable because we recognize that that will improve access for working Americans to our health care system.

This Republican House and the Republican Senate have responded and passed health care reform that makes health care more affordable by making it easier for small employers to band together and pool their employees so they get more affordable group rates on insurance; increasing the self-employed tax deduction, and, thanks to